

REMARKS:

Claims 1-7 are currently pending in the Application.

Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctively claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1,2 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hammond Jr. in view of McCarthy.

Claims 3-6 were indicated as being allowable if rewritten to overcome the §112 objections.

No claims were allowed.

Applicant has amended the claims as suggested by Examiner for the presently claimed invention to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention in order to comply with the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §112. Applicant has cancelled claim 1 and incorporated its limitations into a new claim 2. In the incorporation, Applicant has replaced the word "parallel" to "coaxial" which does not have the linear connotation of "parallel" and still adequately describes the relationship between the cheek plate and mounting module. Applicant has also eliminated the word "may" in claim 2 and reworded claims 4, 6, and 7 to further define the receiving interface and its function. As to the slideability of the modules, the entire Application is based on a stock module sliding onto a mounting module underneath a cheek plate. Therefore Applicant is somewhat confused as to Examiner's meaning and, if these Amendments

Jan 05 06 09:56p

Geoffrey E. Dabbin

801-969-6609

p.5

5/6

C:\Clients\Fitzpatrick\GDRMF010\Amdt2.doc

are insufficient to place the Application in a state of Allowance, requests a teleconference with Examiner.

REGARDING EXAMINER'S §103 OBJECTIONS BASED ON HAMMOND, JR. IN VIEW
OF McCARTHY:

Applicant submits that to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the cited prior art reference must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. Furthermore, the suggestion to make the claimed combination and reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on Applicant's disclosure.

The slideability of the stock module underneath the cheek plate is neither disclosed in McCarthy nor Hammond, Jr. Therefore using the combination of Hammond Jr. and McCarthy to reject claim 2 is improper. Applicant has cancelled claim 1 and incorporated it's limitations in claim 2 and has made claim 7 dependent on the new claim 2. This should suffice to eliminate Examiner's rejections.

Applicant submits that Claims 2-7 are now clearly allowable over the prior art and
Applicant respectfully requests allowance of these Claims and the case passed for issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: January 5, 2006



Geoffrey E. Dobbin
Patent Attorney
Reg. No. 42,490
4278 South 6220 West
West Valley City, UT 84128-6501
(801) 969-6609

6/6
C:\Clients\Fitzpatrick\GDRMF010\Amdt2.doc